any poor ideas to arise—no doubts about its excellence as a piece of genuine workmanship—nothing to detract from the opinion of its being an excellent production of human ingenuity. The use of cement, however, does allow these poor ideas to arise, while, at the same time, it encourages a meretricious display of exuberant ornament in preference to more valuable qualities. No one surely will deny that a stone column, a cornice, or an arch, more fully satisfy the mind than the same things built in brick and cement.

The above remarks, however, do not apply to all cases, for it is too sweeping an assertion to say that cements should never be used for ornamental purposes. There are instances in which they may be legitimately used without violating a correct theory, but the instances are such as appertain to inferior buildings, and to the particular modes and places in which they are used. It is more consistent with theory to use cements upon the inside than upon the outside of a building, because every thing is necessarily more artificial internally than externally: bare walls and naked timbers would not do inside a dwelling-house—they are artificially covered; and as the artifice has been thus commenced, and must be continued in many other appliances of the habitation, it may likewise be permitted in cornices, skirtings, mouldings, &c., because an unity of intention is thus maintained throughout the building, without any attempt to make the cement pass for other than what it is. But externally this artificial character is not necessary, and therefore should not be indulged in. A particular instance of cement workmanship is the interior of the Alhambra in Spain, where plaster is used to an unlimited extent, and where it is quite admissible, on account of its extremely rich and artificial nature, without any attempt to make you suppose that it is done in any other material. Wherever cement is used its artificial nature should be evident, by its mode of application, and then it would be as legitimate a material to work with as any other; but when it is applied as a deceptive expedient, it is of no value.

In churches, more than in other buildings, it is important to carry out a correct constructive theory, so that the building may appear to have the same truthful character as the religion therein to be celebrated. If any attempt be made to make it appear that the walls, or principal portions, are erected in a manner in which they are not, the attempted deception acts unpleasantly on a reflective mind, first from the mere fact of its being a deception instead of a reality, and then from the building not seeming to harmonise with that truth and honesty of purpose, which especially characterise the Christian religion there intended to be taught and practised. This deceptive construction has often been used in columns, piers, and arches built in brick, cemented over and jointed, to imitate stone; also in cornices, figures, and other ornaments run or cast in plaster, and stuck on, whereby a paltry effect is produced, in place of the delightful solidity, variety, and freedom of sculptured stone, besides the disadvantage of feeling that what you see is mere show applied upon, but not forming part of the solid body of the church.

Contrast this false system with the practice of the architects of the middle ages, and it will be found that their buildings were erected upon sounder principles. They caused all the main portions of their structures—such as the piers, arches, jambs of doors and windows, and the mouldings and other ornamental parts—to be executed with the choicest of the freestone or other materials they had to deal with, using the inferior materials in no place but for the mere walling, and this they sometimes plastered internally, but they executed the principal, or architectural parts, in none but their best material, displayed with its natural surface; and I do not suppose that a brick arch or pier, cemented over, is to be found in any old church in England, except in very early examples built with old Roman tiles. The moderns, however, often reverse this rule, and build columns and arches in plastered brick, while even the same building contains plain walling built carefully with stone.

I consider that we should endeavour to build our churches with all the piers, jambs, arches, angles, mouldings, and ornaments, in freestone; and if the other flat portions of the work must be built in a rougher material, this may be plastered over internally, so long as no attempt is made to make the plaster assume the appearance of stone. The same system should guide us in all other buildings having any pretensions to architectural excellence, unless we are satisfied to continue a paltry mode of building, and to be mere imitators in plaster of those works which greater men have built in stone. I have no sympathy with your last correspondent's gratitude for our cement copies of continental architecture, inasmuch as it is a commendation that discourages all endeavours after originality in ourselves; and I am foolish enough to believe that a good original composition, of plain character, executed in stone and brick, is much preferable to a rich design, or a rich copy of a design, executed entirely in sham stone. The reference to the works at Pompeii is rather an argument for my side of the question than for the other, it being generally admitted that most of those works were of an inferior taste to those of the classic times. It is also possible that the *rosso antico*, observed by your correspondent, was applied in a legitimate position.

The practical objections to the cementing system are numerous; but as I fear my remarks may be too long, I will conclude by only asking the question,—Whether the disaster at Euston-square would have occurred, if the pedestals and columns had been in stone instead of brick? I think not.

E. Nash.

Sir,—Your correspondent, Mr. Mason, in The Builder of the 5th instant, ventures to take Mr. Brandon to task for having fired off a "congreve" against stucco; had he said a broadside, it is no more than the pernicious system deserves. In return, the "amateur" has discharged his popgun at the "architect," but no man who values a reputation for himself, or who seeks to improve the taste of his country, will be turned aside from the straightforward and manly task of fearless exposure of what he deems to be bad as regards taste, worse as to construction, and worst of all as respects economy, even though his doing so is at the risk of offending the self-seeking practice of builders, supported, as it may be, by an instance quoted from a resuscitated city of the ancients.

But if, instead of producing an example from Pompeii, your amateur correspondent could shew that the glorious Athenians of the days of Pericles made it a rule to build their temples with compo and other sham and make-believe inventions, modern architects might pause before they considered stone and marble as superior to their counterfeits; but fortunately for after ages, the Greeks did not employ the shadow when they could use the substance, and hence their wonderous buildings have been handed down to our days as monuments of their taste and construction. But I should like to ask any one, whether amateur or architect, what sort of ruins a city would present to an inquiring traveller in which the architectural splendours were solely derived from compo. This is not the first time that I have ventured to deprecate, in the pages of The Builder, as elsewhere, the use of stucco, which has been, in my opinion, the fruitful source of much that is vile in construction, and puerile and tasteless in art. Monstrous caricatures of architecture, things utterly impossible to be executed in real stone, have been perpetrated in the counterfeit, whilst the first-cost cheapness of stucco, which is the tempting lure, soon becomes as much a fallacy as the other advantages to which it makes claim. It is notorious to all who can and will judge fairly on the subject, that since the general introduction of compo as an external decoration, excellence of construction in brickwork has been almost entirely lost sight of,—one has only to approach a sham-stone façade to be certain to detect a thousand cracks and fissures in the work, which all the future stoppings and patchings, and at last paintings over, will never effectually conceal or remedy. However, I firmly believe that the persuasion that compo is not so cheap in the end as some suppose it to be, is gradually forcing itself on the building mind, for even in the last twelve months we may perceive an inclination in many quarters to return to the honest English practice of building in brick and stone, when the entire expense of stone cannot be afforded.

I trust that such of our architects as have hitherto steadily rejected stucco as a substitute for stone, will still adhere to so laudable a practice, and that their example will be followed by the young and rising generation of architects, for we may rely upon it that we shall not be able to return to a true and honest system of architecture until STONE has driven STUCCO from the field.

G. R. French.

Sir,—Your correspondent, Mr. Mason, in speaking of Bricks r. Stucco, says, that something "may be said on both sides." As yet nothing has been said on the stucco side of the question.

I myself am for "bricks" in preference, and always shall be, so long as we continue to have rain in this country. After a shower, a brick building appears as good as ever, but look next door at that abominable stucco, how green, how damp, uncomfortable, and wretched it looks, what a time it will take to dry,—what can lead them to cover the houses with it? Methinks, all will answer, "to hide the bad materials huddled up behind it."

To those who merely look at the new stuccoed houses for their effect (in dry weather), I would say, examine some of the old brick buildings scattered about all parts of London, with their cornices, pilasters, mouldings, and every portion of the building in red and black brick, and then let them fancy a handsome new street entirely of this material, and I am sure the preference will be given to it instead of stucco, not only for its beauty in dry and rainy weather, but for its durability and cheapness in the end, if not the beginning.

Another correspondent asks, "What effect can be better than that of the Tudor buildings of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, where brick and stone are combined, as at Hampton Court Palace, Eton, and many others? Brick is a material made much use of in this country, and well adapted to the atmosphere and climate, and as the taste gradually improves, we shall see there are great capabilities in the material of being rendered both ornamental and useful, especially if the tax be taken off."

RAILWAY JOTTINGS.

A new locomotive, likely, it is said, to supersede all now in use, has been patented and manufactured by a railway foundry company at Hunslet. The *Leeds Intelligencer* describes its main peculiarity as consisting in the want of a crank axle to the inside cylinders, and the consequent lowering of the centre of gravity. There are other improvements, and it is reported that on the first trial on the Midland, a speed of 75 and 80 miles was not only attained without the least difficulty, but a train of fifty-three loaded waggons, weighing 430 tons, conveyed with perfect ease from Derby to Rugby—a load no other engine has ever overcome on like gradients; so that velocity, the main end of its construction, is combined with power likely to render it a rival unequalled either on broad gauge or narrow.——Anthracite has been introduced for locomotive use on American lines by help of a revolving or endless fire bar, applied to the locomotive fire-boxes by Mr. W. G. Henniss, of Pottsville.——A bridge of three arches, 95 feet above the surface of high-water spring tides, is about to be erected at Saltash passage, in the Hamoaze estuary, with a pier midway, in a depth of 60 feet water forming a stream through a strait three-quarters of a mile wide, and which "runs there with a powerful force." A cylinder 85 feet 9 inches long and 6 feet 3 inches in diameter is about to be plunged into 10 fathoms water by aid of two 14-gun packet origs, purchased by the Cornwall Railway Company for the purpose, and it is intended to exhaust this cylinder of the water, and, if successful, to surround it with another of the same length, but 30 feet in diameter, and weighing 130 tons, thus providing an area of sufficient extent to lay foundations for the piers of this rather formidable work.——The *Mining Jour-*

To learn how to use OCR and PDF Compression visit our website